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Abstract
The article investigates the relation between “embodied passion” and the multidimensional phenomenon of demotivation from a phenomenological perspective. To the conventional understanding of organisational and management studies, behaviour of employees is considered, rationally organised and manageable. But need, intention, motivation and demotivation always refer to embodied as well as emotional situations and expressive processes. Despite its apparent significance, relatively little or limited theoretical considerations have been pursued concerning these neglected dimensions. There are hundreds of motivational concepts and thousands of studies dealing with the forces that give work behaviour its direction, strength and persistence. They offer a diversity and often contradictory evidence in motivational research and practice. Most behavioural and motivation theories follow preconceived starting points and cognitively biased approaches. The whole problematic built into organisational and motivational behaviour assumes that a compliant and programmable worker is possible. With this, mostly motivational theories and concepts ignore the very passionate processes and real constraints under which organisations and its members operate. They severely limit the understanding and effect of the complex motivational and demotivational circumstances; particularly they mostly ignore the concrete contextual levels and emotional dynamics, which cause demotivational processes and realities. Demotivation represents a phenomenon, related to „incorporated” or “embodied dimensions” of organisational culture, always already related to perceptual and emotional experiences. Therefore, this paper will develop a critical phenomenological approach for a more comprehensive understanding of the emotional causes, processes and effects of demotivation.

Introduction
Cultural value changes, new technologies and media, new forms of organisation and altering employment patterns, and new thinking in management contribute to the transformation of the workplace and changing realities of work. (Noon & Blyton). Ongoing downsizing (Cascio 1993) and delayering strategies, outsourcing of certain functions, causing increased sense of job insecurity and post-industrial worker alienation from within large sections of the workforce. The rhetoric use of buzzwords such as flexibility, market / customer orientation, flattening structures, managerial excellence, productivity, quality, retraining, participation and creativity can be debunked (Hilmer & Donaldson 1996) as manifesting only the other side of an inner emptiness of work. Within the all pervasive “discourse of restructuring” the affected
people that work within them find less and less meaning and satisfaction. Frustratingly they are loosing their motivational energies at work. A growing demotivated work force marks a pervasive problem for companies today and could determine the context of the future economies. Demotivated people do not identify with their jobs but often see themselves as having to do what they are told and feel that there is little point in doing more than the minimum to get by. Collectively, this all adds up to counterproductive performance, stifled innovation and creativity and the organisation becoming passive, undermining the best intentions of the employer and the employee. Very intense and escalating demotivation can even be seen as an indicator of internal perturbation or even unrest (Meyer 1977, 260f).

The relationship between people and their work has been researched for a long time. It has attracted psychologists, behavioural scientist and organisation researchers to pursue various approaches to understand, predict and manage human behaviour. A plethora of studies of (work) motivation as part of extended investigations have addressed these issues in question (Wiley 1995). There are hundreds of motivational concepts and thousands of studies dealing with the forces that give work behaviour its direction, strength and persistence, offering a bewildering diversity and often contradictory evidence in motivational research and practice (Pinder 1998). Bound to their conventional perspective with its “Jackass-fallacy” orientation, many motivational theories and concepts appear to ignore the very real constraints under which most organisations operate and which may severely limit the motivational factors that they can provide for employees (Landy & Becker, 1987; Mumford, 1991, Maddoc & Fulton 1998). Particularly they mostly ignore the concrete material-contextual and emotional processes, which cause demotivation processes and realities. To ignore the very physicality and influences of emotions on motivation and demotivation is to miss deceive dimensions. Therefore, there is an urgent need to incorporate “embodiment” into theorising of motivational and demotivational process. For this, an indirect approach is necessary. Instead of investigating motivational processes, this article focuses on what demotivates people. With a phenomenological approach the systemic demotivational realities can be critically taken into account and interpreted. Accordingly, this paper will develop an extended framework for a more comprehensive understanding of the emotional causes, processes and effects of demotivation from a phenomenological perspective. First, a systemic working-definition and phenomenal indicators of demotivation will be suggested and condensed to a „demotivation-syndrome”. With reference to empirical research various emotion-related causes and (ill-)effects of demotivation are disclosed and integrated into a systemic model. The personal, interpersonal and structural influences and interdependencies of demotivation will be distinguished and phenomenologically interpreted. Consequently, phenomenology will be presented as an interpretative framework. In particular the phenomenology of Merleau-Ponty will be outlined, as descriptive and interpretative approach to the basic role of the embodied, emotional and expressive dimensions of (motivation and) demotivation. From a phenomenological perspective organisations will be understood as embodied “life-world”, in which demotivation is primarily not only caused by what employees and cognisely do, but what they live and feel through. With such a phenomenological approach, the role of work-feelings regulated emotional labour, and emotional dissonance and their implications and effects on demotivation can critically be disclosed. Based on the consolidated findings concerning demotivation and the phenomenological insights of incorporate embodiment and emotions their relevance for an different theorising of the motivational and demotivational process will be outlined. The paper concludes with a discussion on managerial and organisational
implications as well as possibilities and limitation concerning an emotional responsive approach for preventing or overcoming demotivation. A special focus is given to ways of a self-organised remotivation.

Understanding Demotivation – Definition, Indication and Syndrome

There is no agreed definition of the construct „demotivation“ or well-developed instruments for measuring it. However, there is evidence that demotivation as a factual influence has serious consequences for the person affected and the organisation at all (Meyer 1978; Spitzer 1997). For a phenomenological “mapping” of the causes, developments and effects of demotivation, there is the need for a comprehensive description and conceptualising framework. For the common sense, “demotivation” is a reduced driving force for thinking, feeling or acting. Someone is demotivated who is neither initiatory nor active. However, demotivation refers to more than just non-acting or unmotivated behaviour. It can also refer to an engagement into “wrong” or counterproductive directions (e. g. non-role- or goal-consonant orientation). Thus, demotivation is not just a reversal of motivation. As a state of dissatisfaction, demotivation refers to a dissatisfying distinct cognitive and emotional state, in which motivational energies of affected person are hindered or have been lost. Demotivation confines and reduces form, direction, duration and intensity of engagement, commitment, or identification with the work content, other people at work or the entire company, which again reinforces the demotivation.

Influencing fields of demotivation

In a demotivating situation, options and integrity which the individual experiences are limited. These options can be specified with auxiliary verbs, as what someone cannot, may not, will not or must do (Schabracq & Cooper 1998, 632). “I can not” stands for a perception of being not able to do something, not to reach a certain goal. As such, it refers to perceived incompetence as well as perceived missing of opportunities and disposal of means, instruments or support. “I may not” denotes the experience of not being allowed to do something (either by others, by oneself, by chance or by rules) and refers to the limits of one’s perceived freedom of acting or autonomy. “I will not” relates to a lack of readiness or intention to want to do or become something. “I must” refers to a perceived obligation or necessity to do something, which may stem from internal as well as external causes (job demands). What one is not able, willing or allowed and obliged to do typically fluctuates over time. Different modalities can interfere with each other. For understanding demotivation it is of crucial importance to know whether a problem stems from a lack of ability, a lack of appropriate means, a lack of freedom, a lack of willingness, or a lack of well-specified obligatory goals. These inadequate forms can result to a demotivational attitude and (non-)acting, which is experienced as an unpleasant, affective or stressing or frustrating state in relation to current activities (e. g. tasks) or social contacts. In addition to affected individuals demotivation refers to interpersonal and structural dimensions. With its diverse cause, interrelated influences and complex effects, demotivation represents a dynamic system. Instead of focusing on separated aspects only, it will important to conceive the interconnected patterns in their systemic interdependencies. It is helpful here to think of demotivation experience as proper to something like territories that are continually marked out and re-marked by actors who are inseparable from that territory, who have their being within its fragile boundaries. Territories are never stable, they tend to move as the practice of re-marking drifts across the epistemic terrain. The relations between them can take on strange topological forms with little relation to obvious geography (Deleuze & Guattari 1988). Due to personal, inter-relational or structural demotivating
processes or corresponding motivation barriers (demotivators): employees suffer from a constraining or restriction or loss of energy and motivational power in particular. Demotivators are those daily occurrences that frustrate employees and cause those who are facing them to decrease, consciously or subconsciously, the amount of productive energy they (can) use in their jobs.

**Phenomenal indicators and signs of demotivation / „demotivation-syndrome“**.

Very often Demotivation can not determined by direct observation or simple causal attribution. Over nevertheless to find a description of demotivational behaviour this can firstly be investigated by indicators and signs which can afterwards be compressed to a „demotivation-syndrome“.

**Phenomenal indicators** for demotivation are:
- Manner of reception and welcoming by employees (e.g. way of speaking and manners in contact situation at the telephone and at the reception)
- Style of non-verbal communication (e.g. body-behaviour, movement, gesture, mimic as expression of the state of soul) and lack of humour in the organisation
- Climate of distance, coldness and pseudo-harmony
- Equipment and design of floors and rooms (in which way is there space for personal shaping?):
  - Design and contents of internal information brochures or informal graffiti
  - What employees tell third parties (family, friends and others) about the company, colleagues and managers and how they evaluate their and the enterprise future

**Phenomenal signs** that conspire to demotivation or lack of motivation include:
- Boredom caused by quantitative and qualitative under- or over- work load res. workload invariability (Fischer, 1993)
- Lack of trust, not being listened to, apathy and indifference, social isolation
- Lack of „ownership of problems“, and sinking morals
- Poor performance and poor time-keeping,
- Non-co-operative attitudes and unwillingness to change.
- Bullying and generic harassment (Brodsky 1976, Einarsen, 1999)
- Scape-goating, prejudicial talk emotional abuse (Keashly, 1998):
- Mobbing and aggressive and hostile behaviour at workplaces (Leymann, 1996; Leymann & Gustafsson, 1996; Vartia, 1996)

**Symbolic Figures** in statistics as indicator of demotivation and organisational climate imply:
- Results achievement
- Absenteeism numbers
- Fluctuation Rate
- Trash-quote/ productivity figures / processing time
- Quality and quantity of complaints by customers
- Quality and quantity of suggestion for improvement (e.g. in quality circles)
- Internal complaints and critique (from bottom up)
- Quality and Quantity of contributions in meetings, and conferences
- Extension of self-initiatives and readiness to participate (e.g. further education or offered seminars)
• Usage of companies offers with regard to social life (sports, culture, celebrations etc.)

**Demotivation-Syndrome**
In general, a syndrome can be defined as a group of symptoms or signs that appear together and that tend to indicate, with some consistency, the presence of a certain dysfunctional state behavioural state or constraining system condition.

A demotivation syndrome can be characterised by:

- Experienced states of stress and alienation (e.g. loss of power, significance, autonomy, locus of control)
- Lack or reduction of social or emotional reciprocity and isolation of the affected
- Decreasing relevance of shared values and common identification
- Lowered internal appreciation of effort, which was and will be invested for past or future realisation of goals
- Decreased consciousness for one own capacity for achievement and self-esteem as well as less confidence in managers
- Declining hope for or belief in a better future or insecurity about the future

This demotivation syndrome reflects in a way an endemic „malady” or „sickness” of the organisation which require a specific diagnosis and therapeutic understanding (Randell 1999). A fragmental approach treats only the symptoms, and rarely inquires into the deeper cause of demotivation problems.

Demotivation marks in some way a passive defence. Ashforth and Lee (1990) describe defensive behaviour as avoiding action by over-conforming, passing the buck, playing dumb, depersonalising and stalling; avoiding blame by playing safe, justifying misrepresenting and scape-goating; and avoiding change by resisting it and protecting their own turf. McIlduff & Coghlan (2000) have described a passive-aggressive behaviour as a concealed way of expressing aggression as a result of experiences and/or perceptions of having been hurt, disappointed, let down, victimised, rejected, bullied or betrayed with resultant feelings of anger, hostility and resentment. Following a pattern of negativism, defiance or provocation the actors of passive-aggressive behaviour express resistance indirectly through procrastination, inefficiency and forgetfulness. The process and ramifications of demotivation are complex. In order to address the implicit problems of demotivation a more thorough and integrated approach will be necessary to examine the underlying influences and to determine the right diagnosis for a sustainable cure. Indicators and the syndromes of demotivation need to be taken seriously into account; but to deal with what they signalise requires a more systemic investigation concerning their crucial fundamental causes and subsequent effects including far-reaching consequences.

**Underlying causes and effects of demotivation**
As demotivation is a multidimensional and context-related process, it not easy to determine linear causal links. Being a systemic phenomenon demotivation can not be grasped in simple cause-effect linkages only. Mostly it is embedded in systemic patterns. Demotivation is caused by a complex interplay of determinants and a host of different influencing and context-bounded processes. Social norms, rules, unwritten laws and procedures situational states or contextual constraints that affect the organisation and its employees all are co-determining demotivation. Factors, which lead to demotivation, refer to personal, interpersonal, managerial and structural aspects and dimensions. The following issues are some of the most potent demotivating causes and
effects probably partially common to most individual or group experiences and companies (Wunderer & Küpers 2001).

**Personal and interpersonal causes of demotivation refer to:**
- biographic specifics (e.g. age, gender, abilities)
- lack of autonomy, restriction of the freedom of acting or loss of control
- conflicts or incompatibility of personal values and convictions with work-life
- mis-fit of work-life-balance
- influences from the private life
- discontent with work content and processes (e.g. work tasks provide insufficient task under-/overload or do not appeal to someone’s abilities and personal themes
- difficult personal relations with colleagues and managers
- perceptions of unfair treatment and lack of personal recognition
- cognitive and emotional dissonance and other incongruities
- Conflicts with colleagues (group-thing, envy, mobbing)
- Problematic relations to customers

**Poor management**
- unclear expectations, ambiguous goals, confusing messages, ambivalent information
- lack of respect and sensitivity to individual needs or preferences
- inconsistent behaviour by those who directly affect success
- lack of full attention and constructive feedback
- deficiency of communication (e.g. withholding or denial of sufficient information)
- suggestions by employees either not sought or not given any attention.
- criticising employees in public. (‘management by embarrassment’) is one of the most humiliating and demotivating managerial practices of all. Pulling an employee up short or ridiculing the person in front of others often turns a potentially good worker into a sullen and bitter employee enemy
- playing "the blame game" (scape-goating instead of focusing on the problem)
- playing favourites with work assignments and incentives (making non-favoured employees feel dumped on and polarizes team members into “haves” and “have nots” who may carry on running battles among themselves)
- delegating inadequate authority (lack of presupposition, or experienced as impertinence)
- experience of procedural evaluation and distributive (outcomes) injustice
- hypocrisy as inconsistency or mismatch between words and needs or deeds
- intrusion into (predefined) psychological and actual job space or time
- unproductive meetings and insensitivity to time schedules.
- counter-productive organisation, due to unresolved quality problems (e.g. related to HR-politics or Low Quality Standards as well as lack of focus, teamwork, planning and problem solving)

**Structural and Organisational Conditions**
- too long or short work-cycles, constraining time-pressure or too high work pace
- deficiencies concerning working conditions (e.g. access or availability to material resources or equipment, work design, time pressure, interruptions) but also incompatible or ambiguous demands and expectations around roles, tasks and responsibilities (reinforced by rigidification) and uncertainty at work.
- insufficient information and communication systems
• bureaucratic organisation where communities of practice, the wonder and joy of learning have not place, where employees’ losing the spaces to dance with the ever-changing patterns of life (e. g. policy manuals and approval processes)
• organisational control practices and constraints
• organisation is failing to remove performance barriers (Longenecker et al 1999)
• unresolved quality problems and lack of effective correcting action systems (causing failure to meet both internal and external customer expectations on an ongoing basis)
• poor organisational and personnel development measurements
• problems with organizational changes (e. g. due to M&A-activities)
• reduction of employee benefits
• rigid redundancy policy (e. g. without outplacement-consultancy)

I will not discus these systemic and interrelated causes here, but focus on the embodied emotional dimensions involved.

Demotivation as an embodied and emotional phenomenon in organisations
In order to understand the experiential and emotion-bounded background of demotivational processes, we need to develop an alternative theoretical perspective. Such can be developed by using phenomenology as interpretative framework, which recognises that emotional experienced demotivation remains irreducibly bound to embodied social and cultural processes. This can help to overcome the ignorance and marginalisation of these neglected dimensions.

Negligence and exclusion of embodiment and emotion
For economic and motivational reasoning human (social and active) actors are defined in disembodied terms as rational agents who make choices through means/ends formulae, based on ‘utility’ criteria or ‘general value’ orientations (Turner 1991). The body, in effect, became external to the actors who appeared, so to speak, as a rational, disembodied, decision-making agent (Turner 1991, 9; 1998, 10). Such disembodied, abstracted assumption based upon a ‘scientific’ worldview (Descartes’ legacy) marginalises lived, embodied experience as merely ‘subjective’ or irrational. However, demotivation represents a phenomenon related to „incorporated” or embodied dimensions of organisational culture always already related to perceptional and emotional experiences. A phenomenological approach offers relevant insights into these neglected dimensions and can contribute to a deeper understanding of demotivation. In particular the advanced phenomenology of Merleau-Ponty allows a descriptive and interpretative approach to the basic role of the embodied, emotional and expressive dimensions of (motivation and) demotivation.

The Embodiment and Expressiveness of Organising
From a phenomenological perspective all those involved in the organising process are first and foremost embodied and emotional beings who are embedded in a specific „life-world”. Advanced phenomenology can help to render explicit these implicit embodied processes and significance of emotional experiences within the multiple constituencies involved.

The role of the body and embodiment
With Merleau-Ponty we can draw the critical role of the body in mediating between internal and external experience; the relationship between embodied action and meaning. We can never experience things or encounters independent of our
“Erlebnisse” as bodily engaged beings; the meaning we bring to our perception is always already a perceiving which is embodied. Thus meaning is not produced by a transcendental or constituting consciousness but by an engaged body-subject” (Crossley 1996: 101). We find the world meaningful primarily with respect to the ways in which we act within it and which acts upon us. The living body, as it is experienced and experiences, is the mediating link to the phenomenal world. This body is both transcendent and immanent, as embodiment is for Merleau-Ponty a “third term” between subject and object. Thus, “embodiment” does not simply mean “physical manifestation.” Rather, it means being grounded in everyday, mundane experience. Our bodies are both physical structures and lived experiential structures, that is, both biological and phenomenological. (Varela et. al. 1991). Embodiment can be used for a deeper understanding to capture a sense of “phenomenological presence,” the way that a variety of interactive phenomena arise from a direct and engaged perception and participation in the world, which includes both physically realised and socially situated phenomena and tacit knowledge.

Perceptual inter-relation
The most fundamental way in which we (as well as and customers) are involved in their “life-worlds“ is our corporeal perceptual interaction (Merleau-Ponty, 1962). Perception is not simply the result of the impact of the external world on the body; for even if the body is distinct from the world it inhabits, it is not separate from it. There is only perception as it is lived in the world. As the perceiving mind is an incarnated mind also perceptual. This yields an account of the „subject“ as a perceiving body, situated in time, and is immersed in the living world. In perceiving the embodied worlds of daily environment, these worlds are constituted as (non-)meaningful. Our cognitive system exists enmeshed in an embodied world in which we do things, where we have skills and social practices that facilitate our interaction with objects or ‘to perceive is to render oneself present to something through the body’ (Merleau-Ponty 1962, 137). In other words our perceptual and intentional consciousness is experienced in and through our bodies: We “body-forth” our possibilities in the world mediated by perception. In some way perception is the dynamic ground of our many relationships with the world. In perceiving the embodied worlds of daily environment, these worlds are constituted as (non-)meaningful, which also implies as demotivating.

Organizations as embodied “Life-Worlds”
This incarnate status of the perceiving subject opens the way to a phenomenological description of the “living present” in organizations. It is through their perceptual selves that the subjects of the organising processes are situated in their environment in a tactile, visual, olfactory or auditory way. Whatever they think, feel or do, they are exposed to a synchronised and interrelated field of the senses, in the midst of a world of touch, sight, smell, and sound. The body responds to meaningful questions posed to it through a situational and inter-subjective experiences in which the embodied agents of organisations integrative take part. A phenomenological understanding of the demotivation process takes these sense-related contacts and “embodied intention "systematically into consideration. In such an intentional space and time organizations and its organising agents are embodied in particular and correlated ways. It is through the body that the agents of the organisational process directly reach their perceived and handled „objects“ of work. All those involved in the organization process – even in intermediated virtual networks and media- always encounter perceived realities through some bodily organs, from an intentional and specific point of seeing hearing or touching. The body responds to meaningful questions posed to it through a situational
context in which the body itself takes part. Thus, the original intentionality of the "bodily consciousness" of the demotivated agent does not feel an "I think", but an "I can or cannot " res. "I relate (not) to". The perception of dissatisfying action or unfair treatment causes a demotivational reality. In other words, the atmosphere from which demotivation emerges is primarily not only what people think about it, but what they live or suffer through within their non-fulfilling ,operative intentionality“ (Merleau-Ponty, 1962, xviii). Both the embodied situation and the perceptual and intentional contexts refer to an implicit dimension of emotions. Therefore, a phenomenological regard of emotions related to demotivation process will be delineated in the following.

**Phenomenology of Emotions and the demotivational realities of organizations**

The term 'emotion' is derived from the Latin, “emovere”, “emotum”, and the french root, e, = out, + movere = to move. Thus, emotion essentially means "to move out." From Webster (1961): emotion is defined either as 1) “an agitation; strong feeling; any disturbance,” and 2) “a departure from the normal calm state of an organism of such nature as to include strong feeling, an impulse toward open action, and certain internal physical reactions; any one of the states designated as fear, anger, disgust, grief, joy, surprise, yearning, etc.” To experience an emotion is to realize, or to 'enact' an (intentional) relation to the world. Thus emotions can be considered as dynamical dispositions for action, rather than only some inner state of being.

If we understand "emotion" as the agitated state in which one is compelled, in one's facticity, to 'move' in one way or another, 'mood' can be understand as one's already understood world as "actual." Thus, mood, from a Heideggarian perspective, is equivalent to "state-of-mind" (Befindlichkeit). To be emotionally means that I am already 'somewhere.' My understanding of where I stand and how this matters to me, dictates how I wish to move (emotion) in my continual project as thrown being-in-the-world. Mood refers to a more passive happening (Morris & Reilly 1987) affecting social behavior (George 1989, 1990, 1991, 1996; George/Brief 1992). In particular, mood is, an aspect of situatedness in time. Heidegger (1972) saw the state of man as being as situated in the Now, being there in imminence of the Future in relation to the impinging Past. The scope of this temporal horizon is extremely broad, as is evidenced by our emotions such as hope and regret, concern with planning for future actions and story-telling about past or imagined events Nehaniv 1999). This vast temporal horizon means that humans will tend to deal with interaction in a way that makes narrative sense. Emotion and narrativity thus intertwine with each other and are relevant to issues of human-tool interaction.

Emotion is fundamentally relational, and always already involves an other. That emotion emerges as 'potential movement' implies a particular bodily orientation to the world. De Rivera writes: “The experience of emotion reflects the transformation of our relation to the world - to the persons, objects, events, and actions that are important to us. These transformations are the movements of emotion and each type of emotion (anger, fear, love) reflects a different kind of transformation. A transformation is not a passive reaction to a given stimulus situation, rather it is a transaction between the person and his environment, a way of organizing the relation between the person and the other so that the response itself gives meaning to the stimulus situation..." (Rivera de 1977, 35).

"Feeling" presupposes a tactile, embodied mode of mood -- something like a "felt sense" which is felt at the level of the body as opposed to cognition. When we “feel” something, we touch it, handle it, examine it, test it, etc. From this basic experience, "feel" metaphorically encompasses sensation in general. It speaks to a kind of awareness. Thus, "feeling" can be defined as that act or condition of one who "feels."
While mood conveys the "self-finding" in the mode of the actual, "feeling" is the embodied aspect of mood, the “felt sense” which exists at the implicit, pre-articulated, lived level of existence, prior to any explicit “self-finding”. When speaking about emotions and feelings, a distinction should be made between the modes and forms of emotions and feelings, between lived emotion as feelings of the lived body, the self and the moral person, and intentional value feelings which reference emotional abstractions and emotional ideals. The latter provide continuity and organisation to the person's life, both with self and others. “These value feelings infuse, animate, and haunt lived emotions” (Denzin 1984, 127). While 'lived emotion' pertains to body, feelings and sensations, and dispositions, intentional value feelings inform the kinds of perceptions one articulates about a current situation. Denzin's approach to 'intentional value feelings' clearly are implicated in volitions and motivations, but also arise from past experiences when dispositions were being constellated. Opposing an one-sided constructionism emotionality, connected to sensible feelings, is not entirely socially constructed. It is this aspect of emotionality that is liable to resist imposed views of reality. The French root of passion, passus, is “to suffer”. Passion, from this root, has come to mean, generally, an extreme emotion, signified by violent and intense agitation. Passion, whether we speak of fear, hate, love, or joy always represents an extreme, focused involvement with a project in the world. This involvement may include either extreme repulsion, such as hate, or extreme desire, such as with love. With passion, one is stirred to ones depths. In this sense, passion seems to take on the quality of a more extreme version of 'emotion.' With passion, one could say, we are more strongly 'moved' by a particular emotion. Passion seems to speak to the depth of our commitment to a given project in the world.

**Emotions in organisations**

Emotions, moods and feelings permeate almost all-social transactions within the organising process. They shape and reflect the structure of everyday-life in organizations. The possibility of expressing or the pressure to suppress, sympathy, joy, satisfaction, dissatisfaction, embarrassment, influences the quality of organising processes in an essential way. Generally, emotions are a constituent of meanings in organisational life (Fineman, 1993). That is to say that emotions do not just have an “impact” on social and organisational life but they constitute the social, demotivating organisational life itself. As “discursive” and “presentational” acts (Langer, 1942) emotions influence the way that members of organizations perceive, interpret, control, evaluate and resist their organisational actions (Waldron, 1994) or non-action. Furthermore the impact of moods on pro-social behaviours and group processes at work have been investigated (George 1996; George & Brief 1992 In order to work out how emotions play a key role in organisational and demotivation-related activities, a phenomenology of working life is required which reflects the following questions:

- What relevance have emotions for the organization?
- How does the sharing of workfeelings influence the dealing with demotivation?
- What are the specific emotionalities, which are most influential for demotivation and ways for overcoming the same?
- What are the „feeling rules“ of organization; and what impacts do they exercise on the „emotional labour“ and for demotivation?
- What role does emotional dissonance play?
- What are the favourable circumstances for creating a fulfilling working culture?
- Finally, which organisational and managerial implications can be derived?
Work feelings, emotional labour and the impact of feeling-rules and dissonance for demotivation

The ambivalent role of emotions within organisations
Emotional energies within organisations are ambivalent. They can support a sense of belonging or solidarity (Collins 1990) or can be misused for counter-social acting (e.g. mobbing (Leymann 1996; Zapf et al 1996) or instrumentalised. Furthermore, emotions both determine and are determined by organisational order and culture (van Maanen & Kunda 1989). On the one hand, feelings influence formal and rational organisational processes and meetings, on the other they are opposed by emotional control and results-driven rational bureaucratisation. Emotions are an essential and immutable part of demotivating everyday organizational life, despite the fact that in research and practice feelings are consistently devalued and marginalised while rationality is privileged. (Putnam & Mumby 1993). Emotions are mostly seen as something to be minimised, controlled or managed by employers/ managers (Wharton & Erickson 1993). As Burrell & Dale (2000, Dale 2000) have argued, for much of western society from Descartes onwards the construction of the separation between body and indwelling consciousness has been strengthened and reinforced. The dualism of rationality and emotionality is socially constructed (de Sousa 1987, Harré 1986; Kemper, 1993; Putnam, & Mumby, 1993): and consequently open to change.

From a phenomenological perspective emotional experiences cannot be separated from cognitive, rational and symbolising processes. In contrast to a naturalistic analysis (Ratner 1989) or a behaviourist approach (Stein & Trabasso 1992) emotions can be understood as evaluative activity for finding and creating appropriate strategies (Solomon 1980; Solomon & Calhoun 1984) always situated in a social context.

Work-Feelings
Understanding the significance of „work-feelings“ can contribute to escaping from this dualistic trap. „Work-feelings“ are those emotions, which emerge from human interaction rather then being imposed by instrumental goals and bureaucratic pseudorationality (Sandelands, 1988; Hirschhorn, 1988; Mumby & Putnam, 1992).

Complex, dynamic and interactive feelings emerge coincidentally with thoughts as a form of activity on the job. Feelings are not merely processed information or affective reactions, but an emergent quality of work as an ongoing process which is therefore unrationalisable (Sandelands 1988). In addition to task effectiveness, emergent work-feelings and their corresponding „emotional labour“ facilitate, a productive or counterproductive resonance. They influence how to negotiate the meaning of various identities (Ashford & Humphrey, 1993) roles and relationships during the organisational processes or in service encounters with customers, rather than conforming to predetermined display rules or to prescribed norms (Wharton, 1993; Wharton, & Erickson, 1993). Organizations exercise a constraining control over displays of feelings in general and „emotional labour“ in particular.

Emotional labour
Morris and Feldman (1996, p. 987) defined emotional labour as the “effort, planning, and control needed to express organizationally desired emotions during interpersonal transactions”. Emotional labour refers to the management of feelings (Hochschild, 1983, 7) or behaviour (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993: 90); creating a publicly observable embodied display. As implicit emotional norms, feeling-rules specify the range, intensity, duration, and object of private emotion, which ought to be experienced, often institutionalised in organisationally sanctioned scripts (Humphrey & Ashforth, 1994).
Through neutralising, buffering, prescribing and normalising the felt experience and its expression, emotions are compelled to conform to the norms of rationality (Ashford & Humphrey, 1993: 109). Following fixed lines and reproducing “official” patterns, employees can be forced to pay attention to feelings which are not their own, causing personal and interpersonal conflicts and with this demotivation. The gap between felt and expressed emotions marginalises individual experiences and negates the intimacy that typically accompanies personal feelings. Organisational control of emotions can lead to the suppression of disagreements, eliminating a productive commitment and creative employee participation (Higgins et al., 1992). The constraints of emotions during interactions with colleagues or customers result in altered relational perceptions and changed communication patterns. Equally an outburst of highly intense negative or repressed emotions may then result in a climate of distrust and disrespect between employees and consequently transmitted towards others (Price et al., 1995).

Thus, work-feelings are intertwined in an ambivalent tension: In organisational everyday-life and during concrete encounters employees often mask and/or simulate their feelings in order to manage the required social impressions avoiding embarrassment, and to save face. The effort to control and to bear the inconsistency of felt and feigned feelings can be alienating, stressful and therefore demotivating. Surface-acting, „expression management“ and ascribed feeling rules - aiming at serving commercial or strategic ends - cause structural and demotivating strain between felt and pretended emotions to be intensified. With a commercialisation of feelings (Hochschild 1983): the possibility for employees to lose touch with their own feelings increases and so reinforces demotivation.

Emotional labour is a Janus-faced reality as it can have both positive and negative outcomes (Rafaeli & Sutton 1989, Tolich 1993): for both the actor and the target. This means that emotion work is not per se either positive or negative; rather, emotion display and sensitivity requirements are related to emotional exhaustion but also to personal accomplishment (Zapf et al. 1999, 396). Emotional dissonance occurs when an employee is required to express emotions that are not genuinely felt in the particular situation. Portraying emotions that are not felt (surface acting) creates the strain of emotional dissonance, which is akin to the aforementioned cognitive dissonance. Empirical investigations have shown that emotions are likely to be faked in approximately 20% of all communications and are reported as being strongly suppressed in about a quarter of communications; and the most frequently suppressed emotion is anger (Mann 1999).

**Emotional dissonance**

Emotional dissonance refers to a disturbed intentional communication at the workplace (Ashforth & Humphrey 1995) in particular related to managerial processes (Park et al, 1986) or normative incongruencies (Abraham 1999, 1998a, 1998b; Rafaeli & Sutton 1987). Societal, occupational and organizational norms give rise to the aforementioned “display rules” that govern the expression of emotion in the workplace (Ashforth & Humphrey 1995; Hochschild 1983; Mann 1997). Demotivation causing dissonance may occurs when the informal display prescriptions of emotional labour - which specify the range, intensity, duration and object of emotions that are expected - not fit with the actual experience, clashing with inner feelings. Emotional dissonance takes place when an employee is required to express emotions that are not genuinely felt in the particular situation. A person may feel nothing when a certain emotional display is required, or the display rule may require the suppression of undesired emotions and the expression of neutrality or a positive emotion instead of a negative one. Emotional dissonance may
originate from “faking in good faith” when the employee accepts the underlying display rule or from “faking in bad faith” when the feeling rule is not accepted (Hochschild, 1983; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). Various authors (e.g. Abraham 1998; Adelmann 1995) propose that faking in bad faith has the most negative consequences. Experiences of emotional dissonance may cause the worker to feel false and hypocritical. Therefore, emotional labour is comprised of both faking and suppressing of emotion causing emotional dissonance which can have severe demotivational consequences. Such dissonance can lead to personal and work-related maladjustment and physical and psychological dysfunction (King & Emmons, 1990) and intra- and inter-personal conflicts, (job) dissatisfaction, and stress (Kahn et al. 1964) decreased work achievements (Morris & Feldman, 1996) and with this cause poor self-esteem, depression, cynicism and alienation (Ashforth & Humphrey 1993): or emotional exhaustion (Abraham 1999) and burnout (Maslach 1982) all leading to demotivation. A mere instrumentalization of managed feelings, using „affect-inducing-procedures“ (Baron, 1993; Isen & Baron, 1991) for behavioural control, has been thoroughly criticised (Kemper, 1990; Flam, 1990; Conrad & Witte 1994) as it remains insufficient and limited. Even though „display-rules“ may regulate expressive behaviour; they cannot regulate expressive (often involuntary) experiences, which are subject to situational stress, mood, fatigue and other factors in addition to normative demands (Thoits 1989, 1990). These problematic aspects of work-feelings are particularly prevalent in jobs with low autonomy and mere representational functions (Wharton, 1993, Ritzer, 1993).

Other studies have shown a differentiated view on the complex processes of work-feelings which can also become a performance game of mutual winners (Wouters, 1989). Taking into regard other roles in life and the psycho-dynamic context (James, 1989; Fineman, 1993; Wharton & Erickson, 1993): or informal realms of division of emotional labour (James, 1993; Hochschild, 1996): which could lead to an extension of the concept of work-feelings. A personalised role enactment and emotional "interpersonal role-making" (Graen 1976) can contribute to a more satisfying self-expression and mutual experience. Thus, there is a tremendous potential that unimpeded expressions of emotion can act as a catalyst for a productive atmosphere. Well-performed emotional labour provides an opportunity to „act out“ (Cheney 1983, 346) one’s identification, that is to express one’s fidelity to the valued identity. Sharing of emotional experiences develops mutual affection, connectedness and cohesion that break down anonymity. Such interrelation and sense of community produce a mutual understanding and may help to develop a productive „self-and-we-identity“. In reciprocal relationships, each person sees the other as sharing meanings and cumulative, relevant experiences. Thus, emotion work is not per se either positive or negative. Rather, emotion display and sensitivity requirements are both related to emotional exhaustion as well as to personal accomplishment (Zapf et al. 1999, 396) and interpersonal satisfaction. Therefore changes in the implicit and explicit feeling rules can bring new life into an organisation’s culture and subcultures, permitting shifts from secrecy to openness, confrontation to collaboration for a self-organized overcoming of demotivation. Through situated perception the embodied emotions can become „organs of expressions“. A re-contextualization of emotions can be more than venting the frustrations or moan sessions of demotivation; it can substantially redefine the emotional „material“ and contribute to a more productive „emotional texture“ of the organization. In this way it will be possible to feel different about feelings because those involved find different explanations and treatments for the emotional „event“ of work (Rime et al., 1991). Consequently the emotional atmosphere influences and even shapes the conditions that determine the interpretations and acting in situated organisational
contexts. Such an organisational climate not only motivates (Matsumoto & Sanders, 1988): but will be also the base for a lasting job satisfaction and an improved performance (Jones & James, 1979; Payne et al., 1976; Schneider, 1990). Hence, the emotional context is not just a stimulating environment for behavioural effort and cognitive variables, but a nested arrangement of structures and processes where the shared interpretations and learning of actors (Pettigrew, 1990) help to shape a creative role-playing performances in the post-industrial world.\textsuperscript{10} and are deceive for getting into the flow-experience (Csikszentmihalyi 1991, 1997; Csikszentmihalyi/LeFevre 1989).

Emotions related to demotivational experience comprise e. g.:

- the ambivalent feelings of emotional labour
- the pleasure or pain experienced by observing the dis-/+functioning of formal and informal rules or ways of behaviour,
- the radiant unfairness or lines of co-ordination among employees and managers;
- the toughness of unbending procedures, (excluding certain narrative practices)
- the nonsensical influence of figures and quantification or accounting approaches with their monetarising controlling consequences
- the ridiculous and foolish way of specific power-politics,
- the kitsch-like manner of feedback as pretentiousness or faux-gravity,
- the grotesques of hypocritical acknowledging and praising,
- the ugliness of prejudiced and unjust criticising,
- the stressful strain of time pressure and the annoying or inauspicious distractions
- the boredom and dullness of unproductive work-meetings or empty rhetoric
- the stifling suffocation of stress and continuos frustration due to work-overload
- the hurting feeling of cognitive and emotional dissonance
- the monstrous violence of subtle, superficial gossip or disgusting mobbing and hostile bullying
- the painful distress and anxiety of fears concerning work-place security and employability
- the dissatisfacion of not getting into flow as an optimal experience

But also with regard to remotivation:

- the sublime and remotivating qualities of responsive and responsible work
- the remotivating encountering of re-gained commitment and trust
- the encouraging occurrence of fulfilling win-win situations
- the promising affection of experiencing the creation added value after not seeing that one’s contribution counts
- the gratifying and delightful re-fulfilment of attained quality at work
- gracefulness of befitting responsiveness to solvable problems of demotivation and the uplifting drive of subsequent successful performance achievement
- the genuineness of innovative organisational developments leading to remotivation
- the beauty of fulfilling work-satisfaction caused by self-organised remotivation

Further relevant feelings related to demotivational processes are fear, rapture, anger, disgust, contempt, shame, guilt, sadness or interest, surprise, curiosity and en-joy-ment are all related. They all are always embodied in temporal, non-verbally expressed, sometimes language’d movements in the inter(-personal-) space carry a specific potential for transformation.
Conclusion – Perspectives of a critical phenomenology for research on demotivation

The aim of this paper was to open up for an analysis of the links among embodiment, emotion and demotivation. This requires a systemic understanding of the complex and interwoven personal, interpersonal, managerial and structural influences and interdependencies of demotivation. Demotivated employees are not one-dimensional figures, but “struggling, thinking, feeling, suffering subject, one capable of obeying and disobeying, controlling and being controlled, losing control and escaping control, defining and redefining control for itself and for others” (Gabriel 1999, 179). As the experiential content of demotivation is “incarnated” in bodily and emotional structure phenomenology (of the feeling and lived-body) allows enlightening interpretation. Merleau-Ponty and his concept of a body-subject the active, embodied, habitual and reciprocal relation to others (empathetic understanding) and the world offers a particular relevant application for investigating demotivation. Merleau-Ponty’s critique of the Cartesian metaphysics projects the possibility of a new, corporeal ontology that reflects the inextricable intertwining of the human “body-subject” with the world it inhabits in organisations. By acknowledging with Merleau-Ponty the intertwining inseparability of "object-knowledge" and "self-knowledge" in the midst of fields of “in-betweeness” chances for an aesthetic reflection, reversibility, receptivity and corresponding responsiveness become approachable. Merleau-Ponty’s approach offers a real chance to work on organising aesthetics with a post-Cartesian epistemology. His anti-foundationalism, anti-essentialism and non-dualism, and concept of (good) ambiguities presaged the best in “postmodernism” (Madison 1988). In fact his basic insights entail the anticipatory articulation of post-modern themes: the relinquishment of meta-narratives, the rejection of a purely objective realm and the centering of the master subject. Merleau-Ponty regards phenomenology as a radical philosophy which should alert us to the fact that demotivation is a cultural reality necessarily linked to emotions and acts of expression whose source is the phenomenal body itself. With this understanding, we can conceive demotivation critically as historical, social, and political process; situated within the embodied relations of the affected persons and their specific contexts.

Phenomenology attempts to understand how meaning is made in human experience, and it sees the lived experience of the world as the foundation of this meaning. According to Merleau-Ponty, there is no foundation beneath experience itself, and that experience is often obscure, hazy, and even opaque, and to clear it up analytically is somewhat to betray its character. Appreciating experience in all its original flux and confusion, we need to regard the fund of unreflected realms, which are also part of motivational and demotivating processes. These spheres are more primary, in the sense that they always go before, the explicit taking up of a position, and to synthesise its fluidities into action and structure or as a researcher into stable “clarifying” categories.

A phenomenological position suggests that the world is in some way always-already meaningful to those who dwell within it. Nevertheless being-in-the-meaning-implicit-world is not in any sense originary. It has its own grounds in the prior arrangement of equipment and elements - the ‘set-up’ - by which the space of representation is ordered. Set-ups have their own particular historical and cultural trajectory. Demotivating experiences, or rather the conditions within which employees experience anything at all, is an outcome of the set-up. What employees feel is afforded by the way the world is ordered. Thus feelings of demotivation or dis-empowerment are directly related to the setting-up of social space. If employees feel they cannot carry on then it is because the web of material relations in which they have their being prevents us from ‘going onwards’.
The challenge of a phenomenological approach towards demotivation in organisations is to describe the intentions and “purpose” of this reality without denying its density and obscurity. We need to catch up with it in the sense of characterising its processes while acknowledging in that very act that reflection never can reach or get its phenomenality completely. Therefore, what is needed is a descriptive and interpretative approach to the basic role of the embodied, emotional and expressive dimensions of demotivation within organisational life. Critical oriented phenomenology offers a form of knowledge that is multidimensional, avoiding the reduction of knowledge about demotivation to linear, quantitativ-formalised analysis. As a reflective approach it can open the doors to new possibilities by exploring unexamined assumptions and comparing these with the resonance of lived experience.

Allowing careful descriptions of perceptual and emotional demotivating experiences without preconceptions about causal mechanisms, these can complement causal-explanatory theories, within a “mutual accommodation” (Varela et al. 1991). A modified phenomenological reduction (i.e. suspensive) method applied to demotivational phenomena is not, as in Husserl, to bracket off the world in order to discover the pure, worldless (de-con-textual) structures of consciousness, but rather, as in Merleau-Ponty, to use the distance supplied by the reduction as a heuristic device to reveal and interpret the genuine demotivating processes, implicit in embodied and emotional processes. This implies to hold in abeyance the value of our own beliefs and understandings in order to be open to the experience of how the demotivating realities unfold. By “bracketing” our experience of the “object” itself, holding off preconceptions, personal knowledge and beliefs in the adequacy of that knowledge we are setting the stage for the phenomenological description of the various counters and relations that make up the complex demotivating contexts within organisations. With this we can built a acausal, non-reductionistic and non-reifying approach for understanding narration in organisations by creating descriptions of actual demotivating experiences.

This can lead to questioning presuppositions and offensive usurpation of conventional approaches. It can highlight and sensitises employees and managers to recognise that in being demotivated they are also being acted upon. A critical phenomenological perspective can unveil how a “corporate colonisation of the self” forces workers to capitulate, collude or adopt defensive postures (Casey 1995). Constructively, it can help to who the employees’ agency and capacities to evade or subvert the evident or “insidious” technologies of power which determine demotivation in the daily grind of organisational life. Demotivation is always contextualized in networks of interaction of knowledge and power. Thus, it can be interpreted as localised struggle of micro-politics. Within the “practice of everyday life” as an embodied context (Küppers 2001); subversive “tactics” of resistance (de Certeau 1984) can emerge to re-interpret or even create alternatives for opening up new spaces for expression. For demotivated employees’ small and indirect ways of resistances are possible and practised. Creating their own identities and cultures in a terrain that lies beyond the reach of the dominant organisational discourse (Gabriel 1999; Thompson & Ackroyd 1995) they can and do reach out for remotivating themselves. Thus, organisations understood as embodied life-worlds can contribute to understand where further self-organised remotivating by employees is possible or feasible.

Overall, the phenomenological approach of this paper represents a framework for further analysis. It provides a „bedrock“ for more rigorous theory building and empirical testing. The methods of phenomenology offer alternative pattern metaphors for understanding demotivating processes in organisations. Critically they could contribute to re-examine the implications of variation in qualitative technique. For
example phenomenological interviews (Kvale 1983) are a powerful means for attaining an in-depth understanding of other persons embodied and emotional experience. Thus adding to epistemological options and relating to primary knowledge and enhancing practices, phenomenology can bring researchers in closer touch with real-word demotivational processes in organisations, while ascertain the heterogeneous dimensions involved. As differentiated reminder of the life-world’s multifaceted wholeness and tremendous multi-dimensionality, a phenomenology of aesthetic organising is likely to serve as a helpful antidote to part-views and one-sided analytical-rational methods. Of course phenomenology itself is only one method or approach of interpretation among others; and therefore not privileged to the foundational status (e. g. as Husserl sought) but which no position can claim in a world of conflicting interpretations. Nevertheless, phenomenology points to one doorway, which could lead conventional organisation studies out of its somewhat self-made enclosures and the prison of methodological devices and habit-routines, which binds scientific perceptions. Moreover a critical phenomenology may contribute constructively to the contemporary epistemic odyssey of organisation and managerial studies, as a passage between Scylla (the rocks of dogmatic modernity) and Caribdis (the whirlpool of dispersed postmodernity).

It is hoped that the phenomenological framework proposed in this article may contribute to a more holistically oriented research on embodied and felt experiences of demotivation in organisations. As by taking into account the incorporated, emotional and symbolic dimensions phenomenologically, a different and extended understanding of the causes and developments of demotivation process in organisations can be attained.
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1 “Jackass fallacy” refers to the conventional carrot-and-stick-approaches, by which men have been treated as jackasses, who must be manipulated and controlled by reward and punishment. This has led to a self-fulfilling prophecy, as employees to respond with appropriate self-defending measures (e.g. communications built around such attitudes by evading, escaping denying and rejecting.) Accordingly they protect themselves against being manipulated and against the feeling of helplessness that inevitably accompanies dependency. Existing motivational theories could become more relevant through an acceptance of a holistic view of the individual in the organisation (Carr and Pihlanto, 1998) which integrates demotivational influences and effects. Such an approach would raise questions like: Why do
organisations consistently fail to live by values demanded on a daily basis? Why does employees’ commitment continues to decline? Why is there a diminishing commitment to organisational objectives? How to deal with demotivated people in every-day life of organisations?

2 Harassment here is defined as all those acts that repeatedly and persistently aim to torment, wear down, or frustrate a person, as well as all repeated behaviours that ultimately would provoke, frighten, intimidate or bring discomfort to the recipient. comp. Brodsky 1976; Einarsen 1999

3 The author describes as characteristics of „unhealthy organisations”: e. g. little personal investment in organisational objectives, indifference at facing problems, mistakes and problems are habitually hidden or shelved, somehow orders, policies and procedures do not get carried out as intended, personal needs and feelings are side issues, people compete, when they need to collaborate, distrust. Concerning treatment Randell mentions divers remedies, training, Mbo, performance appraisal, payment by results, quality circles, TQM, business process engineering, etc. but warns, that if they are applied inappropriately, not only wastefully and disruptively but, more seriously, diverting effort and attention from the true treatment that organisations require at that moment in time. Randell demand that organisations need to give up their obsession for treatments and the search for a quick fix for their ills. Effort should be placed on devising a thorough diagnostic framework to enable precise diagnoses of what needs to be done for or by an organisation to cure its ills and maintain its health. The starting point is a procedure for deciding what resources are required: organisations can be starved or can starve themselves. The implications for the work of the next generation of HRM directors of organisations should now be clear. They should be the general practitioners for organisational health, the organisations’ diagnosticians, using out-side specialists where necessary, as medical GPs do; they should be taking the organisational pulse, looking out for symptoms and thinking proactively about the behaviour of their organisation. They should also be the guardian of the key to the organisational medicine cupboard and only dispense treatments once a precise diagnosis has been made. We can but hope that the next millennium will be a healthy one for work organisations.

4 Many organisations, through neglect or unwillingness to deal with certain issues, allow barriers to performance to persist. In worse case scenarios managers may even unwittingly make decisions that help to erect or sustain these barriers. Performance barriers range from an ineffective operating procedure, bad personnel policies, poor equipment to an organisation

5 For Merleau-Ponty, the body is neither subject nor object, but an ambiguous third party. Dreyfus (1996) points out three different meanings of embodiment in Merleau-Ponty’s work. The first is the physical embodiment of a human subject, with legs and arms, and of a certain size and shape; the second is the set of bodily skills and situational responses that we have developed; and the third is the cultural “skills,” abilities and understandings that we responsively gain from the cultural world in which we are embedded. Each of these aspects, simultaneously, contributes to and conditions the actions of the individual, both in terms of how they understand their own embodiment (the “phenomenological body”) and how it is understood by others (the “objective body”). The body can no longer be regarded as an entity to be examined in its own right but has to be placed in the context of a world. Moreover, being-in-the-world cannot itself be understood as a certain relation that obtains between a central body and a surrounding world, but has to be understood in terms of tasks, action to be accomplished, a free space which outlines in advance the possibilities available to the body at any time. (Macann, 1993: 174).

6 Not only do we “know more than we can tell” with respect to our pre-comprehension of phenomena (Polanyi 1966): but we are immersed in a world of experience in which the lived is always greater than the known (Merleau-Ponty 1962). That is, life both precedes and exceeds our very effort to grasp it. Accordingly all pre-positional and tacit knowledge of reality is based on daily dealings e. g. within a „corporate“ environment.

7 The bodily and inter-subjective relations are of particular relevance for personal encounter situations within services. This engagement represents what can be called „incarnational meeting“ (Merleau-Ponty, 1962) of situated body-subjects. For any deeper understanding of service this embodied meeting process between „provider“ and „consumer“ will be crucial. In service interactions the service quality actually emerges at that point where the embodied „production“ and „consumption“ interpenetrate. Employees work directly under the gaze and response of their clients, whilst the experience of the customers is directly dependent on the activity of those serving them. In this way the embodied subjectivities of the „producer“ and the „consumer“ within services sector are fundamentally interrelated. („pro-sumer“).7 And this „embodied interrelation“ is constitutive for the expressive interactions of the service process. However, how does this embodied expression take place? It is through emotions that the corporeal base of service process find an expressive correspondence.

8 Indeed, the very imbrication of the perceiving organism and its surroundings is what lies at the basis of perception. This means that there is no perception in general - a notion which would turn it into an abstract universal; As a result of the incarnate nature of perception, the perceiving subject is always...
changing, always going through a process of rebirth. “Our first task will be to re-discover phenomena, the level of living experience through which things and other people are given to us. We shall no longer hold that perception is an incipient science but conversely that classical science is a form of perception which loses sight of its origin and believes itself complete.” Merleau-Ponty 1962, p. 57 Perception of an external reality comes about through and in relation to a sense of the body. “A theory of the body”, Merleau-Ponty argued, “is already a theory of perception” (Merleau-Ponty, 1962: 203).

9 Sensual Perception re-creates or re-constituted the world at every moment. (Merleau-Ponty, 1962: 207). As enveloped in a living significance for Merleau-Ponty sensation is literally a form of communion. (Merleau-Ponty, 1962: 212) „The sensible gives back to me what I lent to it, but this is only what I took from it in the first place.” (Merleau-Ponty, 1962: 214). In this way sense experience is that vital communication with the world which makes it present as a familiar setting of our life.

10 Concerning a critical the post-industrial service-work as an “embodied role-playing” and the role of “embodied” communities of practice comp. Küpers, 1998, 2000